MUST WE SIGN A BLANK CHECK?

FURTHER TO THE SECRETARY FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.....

Dear Mr. Secretary,-

Thank you for acknowledging our letter of March 16 and for sending your two speeches on Canadian Foreign Policy.

Studying these documents it could be seen that through them you were performing the difficult and ungrateful task of confronting the Canadian people with some of the unpleasant aspects of Canada's relationship to the USA. It seemed apparent that these aspects were no more pleasing to yourself than to those of us who have not been, as you have been, in a position to anticipate them.

You spoke of the difficulties or problems which arise between us, economic problems, for instance, the sudden dislocations of trade brought about by what appears to be ill-considered action South of the border. You pointed the way to a solution of these difficulties in reminding both our neighbor and ourselves of our dependence upon each other.

But then you somewhat reduced the strength of the reminder when you went on to say that this interdependence was one-sided. "....the dependence of Canada on the United States is far greater than the reverse." And you added, "This is a fact which we must accept even if, at times, it makes us feel uncomfortable."

Does it not seem to you that this should be clarified? For instance, small though we are when we compare populations, may we not possess certain things without which the USA cannot act as she might desire to act in certain situations? May we not, for instance, more deeply reflect the moral judgment of mankind? May we not possess a calmer perspective? A better sense of proportion? Yes, and material things, space. The whole Northern gateway to this continent is at our disposal.

If Canada's dependence is far greater than the USA's, doesn't that mean that while Canada is dependent on the USA, the USA is relatively independent of Canada. So then where is the interdependence?

"Above all," you say, "let us give no countenance to the idea .....that Canada can live and grow apart from and without the friendliest relations with its great neighbor." Canadians from coast to coast will echo this sentiment, but they will want to be sure that "the friendliest relations" mean relations between friends and not between master and servant. True friendship never guarantees automatic agreement or acquiescence. It can only exist between free autonomous persons or groups.

Now those who would be imperialists, those who aspire to dominate others, must forego friendship. If the USA should wish to embark upon a course of twentieth-centuary imperialism (and this is not an impossibility) then Canadians might wish to forego the prospect of earning a sunny spot in the American Century by closing their eyes to the inevitable iniquities of all empire. Canada might even be willing to suffer inconvenience and temporary hardship while retaining possession of her own self-respect.

But whatever we do, we cannot have it both ways. We must act either as friends and speak sharply to our friend who contemplates a suicidal act, or we must count Canada as merely a rounding out of the continental United States.

Does it make sense to talk of interdependence and friendly relations if we commit ourselves in advance to be on the same side with them in any major war?

In your Toronto speech (March 14), page 4, you say that though US commitments in Taiwan have not been accepted by us "that is not the same thing as saying they may not involve us." And on page 7 of the same speech you make a declaration which seems to us fearful and fateful: "in any major war we must be on the same side."

Is not this an abandonment of moral autonomy?

Why cannot we say to the USA: "You are much bigger than we are and perhaps could swallow us if you wanted to. But that has nothing to do with the rights or wrongs of your intervention in Taiwan. That intervention you excuse on the grounds of strategic necessity. But what strategy is this? Surely a strategy which reaches 6000 miles from your coast to take strong points less than 100 miles from China's coast, strong points, moreover, which belong by treaty, signed by the USA, to China, can only be called by one name: aggression. We will have none of it. We condemn it in the strongest terms."

Perhaps, Mr. Secretary, you have already carried on more or less along these lines private and confidential communications with the US State Department. But in the rather desperate situation in which we find ourselves that is not enough.

We must make it crystal clear to the USA that they must not count upon our support in any adventure they may undertake, and in particular and in advance that we abjure and condemn any conjectural or proposed attack by the USA on China under the guise of "protecting" Taiwan.

The Canadian people, because of their close geographical and historical relationship to the USA are deeply disturbed by the situation in which the USA finds itself today. The US Congress has given the President full discretion to engage US forces in a preventive attack upon China if he thinks it is necessary in the "defence" of Taiwan. In addition, the USA has signed an assistance pact with Chiang Kai-shek.

What is this "defence" of Taiwan? In your Toronto speech you referred to the USA as "the strongest bulwark in our common defence against those aggressive despotisms which are today the greatest threat to peace." Yet, in all the world where can be found a more aggressive and blood-thirsty despotism than in the Chiang Kai-shek regime in Taiwan? Neither Chiang nor his American friends hide their aggressive intentions. They shout them from the housetops. The USA is thus openly keeping alive and supporting Chiang Kai-shek's ambition to occupy and rule the mainland of China. To what can this lead if not to a major conflict between two of the most powerful nations on the globe?

It is a frightening prospect for Canadians, caught as we would be, if Russia should be drawn in, in a three-cornered vise.

From all of which it becomes clear that Canada must speak at once , sharply and publicly, to bring to bear all possible moral pressure upon the USA to recognize the existence of China and stop interfering in China's domestic affairs.

Sincerely,
Kenneth Leslie,
Editor, NEW CHRISTIAN.

ACT NOW AND BREATHE TOMORROW!!

NEW CHRISTIAN appeals to its readers to join and to support EVERYBODY'S COMMITTEE TO OUTLAW WAR, to sign its appeal to Congress, to distribute its literature and to form discussion groups which may become active branches of the Committee.

This committee has no church or party affiliation. It is just people, plain Joe Doaks and their wives who find themselves behind the hate-ball of atomic vaporization and who see no future in it.

Fed up with official double-talk and dilly-dallying as the nations race to their doom, these so-called humble folk, postmen, taxi-drivers, housewives, business men and women, machinists, students, have determined to take action as the constitutional rulers of the nation and to force action on their representatives in line with the dynamic appeal of General MacArthur, to which we referred recently as "MacArthur's Snowball."

The Committee is distributing the MacArthur speech widely, using it to support their proposed Congressional Resolution to OUTLAW WAR. To obtain copies of the Resolution write to Everybody's Committee to Outlaw War, 1805 Wilshire Blvd., (Room 204), Los Angeles 57, California. Act now and breathe tomorrow!!

+ + + + + + + + + + +

PRACTICAL ATHEISM

One reason for the wide success of the false prophets of our day, the Sheens, Grahams, Peales in the pulpit and the existentialists and crisis theologians behind them, is that they operate in a field virtually cleared of all opposition, and tragically cleared by the very opponents who should be in there contesting every inch of the ground.

These false prophets have only to call their opponents atheists, whereupon their opponents, glorying in that appellation, promptly walk off the field in which the struggle should be going on to define and redefine theism. And in their absence the enemies of the people, undisturbed in their monopoly, are not prevented from going right on giving the people stones instead of bread. It was this field we entered in 1938 under the name of PROTESTANT and continue today under the name NEW CHRISTIAN. It was in this field that John Macmurray pioneered. The great Dr. Harry Ward, his faithful disciple Claude Williams, our beloved Tunnicliffe and Evans and their English colleagues, Bill Baird, a strong clear light in the clerical darkness of Chicago, the brilliant Bradley of United People, all these and others, each in his own way, have crossed spiritual swords with the forces of obscurantism and have striven to rescue the 'God' concept from its irrelevance, its triviality, its capricious injustice, and to restore to it something of the character implied in the sayings and deeds of Jesus and of his disciples down through the centuries.

Yet we have not been, numerically or morally, strong enough to dethrone this 'God' who is a whimsically cruel tyrant, who plays favorites among his children, a 'God' far worse than the most primitive conception of deity in, or out of, the Old Testament, in fact a blood-thirsty monster who is being used as an instigator of atomic war. This 'God' must be torn from his place of authority and hurled into the outer darkness whence he came, and where he belongs. For truly he is the Prince of Darkness and those who serve him are the servants of Hell.

The authors of "Return to Reality", to which we referred in our last issue, have taken off their gloves and have called this whole school of false 'Christian' leadership to account. They have punctured the Screwtape Letters fraud. They have exposed the moral cowardice of Kirkegaard and his disciples. They have debunked the rocking-chair pessimism of Niebuhr. And they have brought this little old world of ours back into focus as the world God is in love with and in which His society of mutual love will come to pass!

We hope Stanley Evans and his publishers won't mind if we take the liberty of quoting some passages from his book. Here are a few pages from his introductory chapter, "The Flight from Reality," which we shall entitle with the text (Mark ix, 39) he uses in the course of his argument:

HE THAT IS NOT AGAINST US IS FOR US

(Earlier in this chapter Evans has traced those Anglican movements issuing in the positive this-world emphasis of such reports as the Archbishop's Report on Christianity and Industrial Problems (1918) and the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Doctrine in the Church of England (1938). Then he examines C.S. Lewis, D.R. Davies and Miss Dorothy Sayers as popularizers of bad theology and bad economics. And now he takes up the positive theme of Christians and non-Christians working together for the welfare of their fellows.)

"The readiness ofmany of the Churches of Eastern Europe to find a way forward with those who entertain philosophical views different from their own re-echoes in a most interesting fashion a current of thought that was strong among the Christians of the second century who gladly welcomed anyone, either living or dead, whose thought or activity appeared to them to assist in the forward march of humanity. So Justin Martyr not only welcomed Plato and Aristotle but claimed Heraclitus, the father of all dialectical philosophy, as a Christian.

"For Christianity in Western Europe and in the United States of America, this question of relations with people of different philosophical views has become the dominant issue of our epoch.

"The widely held view that there can be no common ground with atheists is nonsensical. No Bishop finds it difficult to vote on the same side as an atheist in the House of Lords provided he himself thinks it right to vote in that particular way. No Church leader refused to endorse the second world war on the grounds that there were atheists among the allies.

"It has, indeed, always been the experience of humanity, that the movement towards 'salvation,' the search for truth and beauty and goodness, has never been confined to one nation, race, sect or philosophy. In certain ages its fullest expression has been found sometimes in one national group, sometimes among the adherents of a particular philosophy. It was certainly the proud claim of the infant Christian Church that in it the movement of humanity had reached its peak. That did not, however, lead it into the error of assuming that only those who were officially within it were playing any part in the redemptive process. As Jesus had said, 'He that is not against us is for us,' so Paul had preached to the Athenians, 'Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.'

"Were only those within the Church who were baptized? In the age of persecutions this problem presented itself in an acute form. Many people went to the lionsfor the crime of harbouring Christians or for passing on Christian literature, or for opposing the persecution, who had never been members of the Christian movement. On the other hand many who were its members kept away where they might avoid the conflict when it was at its height, and as the result of cowardice

or weakness effectively betrayed the Church. No narrow, hard and fast view would meet this situation. Augustine, who had the grace of realism, if not of tolerance, expressed it by saying that 'many who seem to be within are without, and many who seem to be without are within.' (De Baptismo V, 38.)

"This idea of fundamental importance has always been accepted by Christian thinkers. The Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York (1938; p. 139) commented on Augustine's phrase with approval and added:

> This thought found later expression in the phrase 'some who are of the soul of the Church are not yet of its body: and some who are of its body are not yet of its soul.'

"The recorded teachings of Jesus himself endorse this line of thought. The picture he gave of a judgment in which many of his most allegedly zealous supporters would be rejected and many who claimed not to know him would be accepted, gave as the standard of judgment and the path of salvation, the attitude of men to their fellow-men. Did they 'feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit the prisoners'? (Matt. xxv, 31-46.) The Kingdom of God, he prophesied, 'shall be taken away from you and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.' (Matt. xxi, 43.)

"The argument that outside the Churches people cannot be working for the future of humanity 'because they leave out God,' is deeply subversive of theism. It is a queer God, who can be left outside his own creation! Since all theists argue and are bound to argue that the source of all good and of all truth is God, then wherever truth and goodness are seen, or through whatever agents they are disclosed, the work of God is seen. .....

"The right answer to this question is today fundamental to the future of the Churches and their contribution to world affairs. In the Middle Ages almost the whole of Europe was 'Christian.' Controversies, whether philosophical or political, were conducted within the terms of theological thought. Today things are different. Throughout the world millions of the most self-sacrificing human beings, of those who place the well-being of the community beyond their own, are outside the Churches and speak a different language.

"Will Christians co-operate with them and find a common way forward? Of those who answer 'No' to this question, too many do so because they do not want the kind of world this co-operation would produce. They do not want to see the proud cast down from their seats and 'the rich sent empty away.' (The Magnificat.) .....

"The whole matter is put very well in a leaflet circulated to the clergy by the Central Council of the Church for Religious Education, to assist them in leading the prayers of their congregations on the Annual Sunday of Prayer for religious education. (1947) 'Let us begin,' it says, 'by remembering that all life and all truth and all wisdom comes from God: that all attempts to understand and to make plans for human life and society apart from God are false and must lead to disaster.' If the second part of this statement has any meaning at all, it is in direct contradiction to the first part.

"What does it mean to make a plan for society 'apart from God'? If it means apart from the inspiration of God, who is to judge when it has been given? Is it a claim to exercise a monopolistic control of this inspiration via the Churches?

"Traditional theology has always maintained that God is the perfection of truth and beauty and goodness. A society planned apart from God is one planned apart from truth and beauty and goodness and the other virtues which, it is claimed, are the nature of God. Many plans which reflect none of these things have, of course, emanated from Churches and Church people. The only valid question

that can be asked of a statement of fact or a theory is not 'is it of God?' (unless further stages of an argument are advanced) but 'is it true?' If it is true, then, ex hypothesi, it is of God. 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' (Matt. vii, 16.) .....

"...one by one, religious thinkers take to flight. They flee revolution, they flee social change, they flee the earth, they flee 'humanitarianism,' they flee a future for man, as in the past and still today, they flee the conclusions of science.

"But what are all these things? They are reflections of reality, aspects of reality. And what is God is he is not reality?

"If words have meaning and if ideas have root, we cannot burk the fact that the flight from reality is the flight from God.

"The Churches in England today are indeed in the position of the Orthodox Church at the end of the last century, of which Fr. Gregory Petrov wrote:

> In the Church the creative power of truth became withered, dried and anaemic, separated from life, the thought of the Church was condemned to turn about in a world of abstract dogma and theological discussion.... God was reasoned about without being introduced into life itself. A sort of special atheism was created—practical atheism. Certainly in words and thoughts the existence of God was recognized, but live activity went forward as if it was not so, as if God was only an abstract word, a sound without meaning.

"The present headlong flight from reality in Church writers and thinkers leads to precisely this —to practical atheism! Honest atheism has its merits. Religious atheism has none.

"The first claim we must therefore make of our Churches today in the name of their own religion is that they shall return to reality. A good beginning would be for them to listen seriously to what the Churches of Eastern Europe have to say to them. To this might well be added a strict injunction not to bear false witness against neighbors and not to purvey 'facts' about Eastern Europe which they have not been prepared to check.

"These two things alone would not only play a major part in transforming the whole world situation. They would also begin to transformthe thinking of the Churches. It would no longer be necessary to flee their own essential teachings under the influence of an ignorant fear of 'Communism.' It would be seen at once that there is hope for humanity and that the basic Christian idea of the redemption of humanity was right. .....

"Christianity began as a way of life. How can this way of corporate living be made effective in the modern world? As soon as this question is seriously faced a wide area of common ground will be found between Christians and Communists which will provide tasks enough for this generation.

"The Christian 'he that doeth the will shall know of the doctrine,' is not far removed from the Marxian 'theory and practice go together.' So soon as Christians face the problems of their own idea of fellowship (koinonia) in the modern world, of feeding the hungry and clothing the naked, they will at once be compelled to bring back into prominence their own ideas of the Kingdom of God upon earth and will also find that the faith which inspired their predecessors to brave the lions of Nero will also enable them to face and overcome whatever obstacles confront them today. .....

"'I came that they might have life and have it in abundance' is the very basis of the New Testament. Forms of Church organization and administration, reunion, evangelism, all these questions which are so widely discussed, are of value only in so far as they subserve this fundamental purpose .....

INTERPRETING THE NEWS

By Louise Harding

How War Scares Start: So long as the US insists on maintaining the discarded and discredited Chinese traitor? Chiang Kai-shek, on territory belonging to China, the situation is most precarious.

Those who are known to belong to the China Lobby, as well as others who give every symptom of being thus affiliated, naturally will do all they can to push the world over the brink. Thus, toward the end of March, we had this from Washington (UP):

> "A Red Chinese attack on Matsu island, carrying with it the threat of a major conflict in Asia, may come around April 15, high military sources said today.
>
> "The grave view held by Washington military leaders paralleled the views reported in a UP dispatch from Tokyo on March 9. The Tokyo dispatch said United States military leaders in the Far East believed that a major war in Asia might be only weeks away....
>
> "Senator Styles Bridges said today the Far East situation is 'very serious' and that reports indicate Red China will be ready to hit Nationalist-held offshore islands within two months.
>
> "'....The puffed-up, swaggering Red Chinese are certainly doing a lot of sword-rattling....'"

The 'sword-rattling' consisted in saying they would take their own territory back. It is Bridges who is the swashbuckler. And Dulles. The same press dispatch mentions "Dulles' blunt warning of March 8 that Communist aggression would bring United States and Allied retaliation from southern, central and northern fronts and that no portion of Red China would be considered a safe sanctuary."

Britain and Canada may attempt through their officials to draw a distinction between supporting the Chinese tyrant and robber on Taiwan (Formosa) and on Quemoy and Matsu: the fatal evil leading on to the very possible destruction of the world is the insistence of US Reaction in recognizing as the head of the Chinese nation someone that the people of China do not so recognize.

Dulles Threatened War in 1952: And how much of a shield and buckler against war with China is John F. Dulles, the IGFarben-connected cartelist who, under Democratic and Republican administrations alike, holds power in Washington? We may recollect that the conservative Daily Telegraph of London, Jan. 22, 1952, quoted Dulles thus:

"Mr. Dulles, architect of the Japanese Peace Treaty, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee today, in asking for its ratification, that the United States must take positive steps to secure the downfall of the present Moscow-dominated government of China.

"We cannot, said he, expect a change in China to take place automatically. To realize such a change will require something besides a negative and purely defensive policy in Asia on the part of the leaders of the free world, notably the United States. It will require determination to promote freedom and independence in Asia, and action consistent with that determination, as opportunities arise." (Italics added.)

Again Dulles Menaces China: (Reuters, Feb. 12, 1952)

"The United States 'should not allow the mainland of China to remain under Chinese Communist control,' Mr. Dulles said in Washington on Sunday. ....

"On future relations between China and Japan, Mr. Dulles said: 'I think in the long run you cannot keep an absolute barrier between Japan and the mainland —so we should change the character of the regime on the mainland.'"

America's Allies: Even the reactionary Ray Tucker writes (San Mateo Times, March 31):

"Only with great reluctance will Congress vote $2 billion for Asian military and economic aid, because of official admission that a vast amount will be pocketed by foreign government officials in South East Asia as 'honest graft.'

"The only defence for tolerance of these dishonest practices on the part of our allies is that the grafters lead the fight against Communist expansion in that area.....Thailand, for instance, is ruled and controlled by a small clique of politicians, policemen and military officers, from the top down to minor officials. They enjoy power as authoritarian as the Kremlin's. Nobody dares to challenge them save the Communists, whom they hate, if only because the opposition represents a threat to their pilfering.

"These bosses, like Tammany grafters of old, demand a cut on every contract for construction and improvement financed by American money. They insist on majority ownership of private enterprises established to modernize production and distribution of food and clothing and beverages.

"Nor do they expect to pay for the stock; they require that it be handed over outright. They also stipulate that all key jobs be given to their hordes of relatives, regardless of their efficiency or experience. .....

"In Korea the grafters resemble more closely the racketeers of Capone days. They drag down their profits from the disposal of about $100,000,000 of surplus war materials.

"When auctions are held, they browbeat legitimate rival bidders so that they obtain the goods at extremely low prices and sell at huge profits. If an honest merchant outbids them, he is forced to give them a 20% rake-off as 'protection'.....US representatives have demanded that Syngman Rhee, South Korean president, clean up the mess. Otherwise we shall sell the property elsewhere, although the sales were originally intended to rebuild the nations's economy."

(Careful! Rhee might spill some more beans!)

Tucker continues:

"Millions of dollars were wasted when we financed Chiang Kai-shek's regime during World War II. His relatives and friends sold for their own enrichment supplies, vehicles and weapons intended for use against the Japanese or Communists. Our military and diplomatic agents protested in vain. ....."

No Honor Among Thieves: Once more in alliance with the nazis -- who will officer the new West German army -- why cavil about a little pilfering? Hitler was a champion plunderer as well as mass killer, but the Halifaxes, here and abroad, believed before the war that he had retarded the spread of bolshevism.

The Brasshats Perform: On the evening of April 8 the radio announced that two US scientists had protested against exploding another single bomb until measures had been taken to ascertain whether harm to the people might result. The militarists responded by saying that on the very next day they would set off two bombs —one of them the largest of this series of tests.

Who is running this country and for the benefit of whom?

Blasting Continued: "Hush, Little Baby, don't you cry,
You'll be an angel, bye and bye."

At a press conference in Washington (March 15, AP) Dulles spelled out a policy, which, he said, was based on a knowledge that some atomic weapons are gradually replacing more conventional types in the arsenal of America's armed forces....These new atomic weapons, he said, create no dangerous radiation problem for civilians as do the far bigger atomic and hydrogen bombs and devices.

In discounting radiation danger by using small atomic weapons, he said, American troops have been working close to them almost daily in war exercises in the Western States.

--Well, we had understood Mr. "Straws" to insist that danger from the gigantic Bombs was, really, almost trifling--that the poison in water, for instance, soon dissipated in the ocean waves, and that the contaminated air was wafted away, (whither, however, was more than he could, or at any rate did, say.)

The Chinese, hearing of the new 'pin-pointing' weapons, came right back and said the US would be greatly surprised to find it had no monopoly in such. It is conceded that they can take Quemoy and the Matsus; after which, it is threatened, Messrs. Dulles et al. will heave some 'massive retaliation' at the mainland. After which the fat will find itself in the fire.

President-General Eisenhower sides with the continued testing of A-bombs. He and Dulles (Churchill joined them) hold that only Allied superiority in the line of Bombs can act as a deterrent to Russia starting war. --What would deter the Allies, this superiority once achieved, from starting war under this theory is not told to an anxious world.

A leaflet put out by Contemporary Issues quotes the French scientist, C. N. Martin, in Comtes Rendus, official organ of the French Academy of Sciences:

Effects of the Bomb:

(1) Chemical consequences...a 20-megaton bomb can form a million tons of nitric acid...It is known that, beginning at a certain level of acidity, the metabolism of plants may undergo a complete disorganization. (The Mch29 Yucca Flat explosion was about 25 megatons.)

(2) Climatic effects....partial interception of solar radiation; local floods cause by heavy rains on the passage of fragments of the mushroom cloud....disturbance of the normal wind-pattern....

(3) Radioactive effects....presence of an important quantity of radioactive carbon...the mechanism by which carbon products are thoroughly distributed and consequently absorbed by all living beings is well known. (Radioactive Carbon 14 has a half life of 5,100 years.)

Genetic effects.... it seems that a variation, even though small, in the.....natural level of radiation would cause important and irreversible effects.

The Answer of Counter-Revolution to all this is that, terrible as Death by the Bomb would be, existence under socialism is far more horrible.

In his book, "The End of the World", a work commended by Albert Einstein, Kenneth Heuer, Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society, speaks of the heat of a nominal atomic bomb (20-megatons):

"When an atomic bomb is exploded in the atmosphere, its radiation is absorbed considerably by the air immediately surrounding the bomb with the result that the air is made white with heat. About one ten-thousandth of a second after the burst, the ball of fire has a diameter of about ninety feet; and the temperature is then 300,000 degrees centigrade, or fifty times greater than that of the sun's surface."

(At great length and in patient detail, Louise Harding tells with thorough documentation of the floods, hailstorms, blizzards, dust-bowls, crop destruction, earthquakes, etc., that have followed in the wake of each Bomb exploded. This compilation will be of extreme value at some future date--that is, if there is any future!)

+ + + + + + + + + + + + +

NEW CHRISTIAN

APRIL 1955

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. Imre Kadar
Rev. J. Spencer, Jr.
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Ida Pruit
Leslie Roberts
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etienne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams
Rev. Mercer Wilson

NEW CHRISTIAN is published monthly by New Christian Books, 95 Argyle Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No Agents.**

LIBRARY
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
297 FOURTH AVENUE
NEW YORK 10, N. Y.

NEW CHRISTIAN

April, 1955 Edited by Kenneth Leslie

FURTHER TO LESTER PEARSON

MUST WE SIGN A BLANK CHECK ?

FLIGHT FROM REALITY

Stanley Evans

THE MEANING OF THE NEWS

By Louise Harding

Vol. XI, No. 6 30 cents